

Editorial

As our fingers hover over the keyboard of our Editorial typewriter we realize that we have got to the moment we have been thinking about for some while. These are the first words of the fiftieth volume of ANTIQUITY; when the first number appeared in March 1927 it opened with this bold manifesto:

ANTIQUITY will attempt to summarize and criticize the work of those who are re-creating the past. Archaeology is a branch of science which achieves its results by means of excavation, field-work and comparative studies; it is founded upon the observation and record of facts. Today the accumulated riches of years lie to our hand, and the time is ripe for interpretation and synthesis. We are emerging from the archaic stage and we are able at last to see single facts in their relation to an organic whole—the history of Man. . . . Here and there attempts are made to summarize a period or interpret a group of facts; but they seldom reach the general public, and remain buried in obscure publications. ANTIQUITY will publish creative work of this character. The EDITOR has secured the willing support of specialists who will contribute popular but authoritative accounts of their own researches. Knowledge thus acquired is alive, for it is derived at first hand from things, not merely compiled from books. Each article will be a tiny facet of the whole; for our field is the Earth, our range in time a million years or so, our subject the human race. . . .

The universal interest in the past is perfectly natural. It is the interest in life itself. There was a time when archaeology was voted a dull subject, fit only for dry-as-dusts; yet it was not the subject that was dull, but its exponents. Those days are over. If proof were needed it might be found in the welcome with which our

preliminary appeal has been received in all parts of the world. We shall do our utmost to justify the good wishes of our correspondents; we have a policy and shall carry it out. We ask only for time to accomplish it. It is barely a year since the idea of founding ANTIQUITY occurred to us, and our contributors are all busy men. But we have made an excellent start and future progress is assured.

There were many who at the time of the foundation of ANTIQUITY thought that it would not last long; it was Crawford's great achievement that he edited it for thirty years, and nursed it carefully through the difficult war years when the number of subscribers dropped drastically and it was difficult to get the sort of articles he wanted. We now face another difficult period with mounting inflation everywhere and a hideous rise in the costs of printing, postage and publication. Fortunately our circulation is large and much of it based on museums, libraries and universities. The real problem of costs was brought home to us when we noticed that the most recent volume in the *Ancient Peoples and Places* series, namely J. G. MacQueen's *The Hittites and their contemporaries in Asia Minor*, is priced at £7.50. The first volume in the series, Geoffrey Bushnell's *Peru* published in 1957, was thirty shillings. Here is an increase in price of four hundred per cent. In 1957 ANTIQUITY cost the same as *Peru*: there were four issues for thirty shillings: today it costs £4.00 for a year's subscription. This state of affairs, alas, cannot last much longer; the subscription must go up, or the number of issues a year reduced from four to three. Possibly both things will have to happen.

☞ We were delighted to get a postcard from Malta, recently, bearing their new and remarkable 1c3 stamp which we reproduce here with the kind permission of the Maltese Post Office and the designer Richard England. This is one of four stamps designed by Mr England, who lives in Malta, to commemorate 1975 as European Architectural Heritage Year. The 3c stamp, a beautiful piece of design and printing, features Mdina which has been chosen by the Maltese National Committee for the European Architectural Heritage Year 1975 to be one of its pilot preservation projects. The 1c3 stamp which we reproduce is a plan of the Ġgantija of Gozo. Surely no megalithic plan has ever before appeared on a stamp? There is of course the famous French one franc stamp of the Carnac alignments which we reproduced here some years ago (XLII, 1968, frontispiece opposite p. 249). When are we going to have a megalithic stamp in this country? A plan of Stonehenge or Barclodiad y Gawres or Maes Howe would look well. We are reminded of the letter we received in July 1968 from the GPO which said: 'We have added your suggestion about a special stamp featuring Stonehenge to the list from which the choice will be made for the 1969 special stamp programme.' That was eight years ago: the Post Office, who had the effrontery to send us our large ANTIQUITY telephone bill in an envelope franked 'Merry Christmas from the Post Office', have obviously no interest in our most ancient national heritage.

☞ In our last number (1975, 267) we promised an editorial comment on the article by McKerrell, Mejdahl, François and Portal entitled 'Thermoluminescence and Glozel: a plea for patience'. McKerrell had sent us a remarkable C14 date which he wanted included as a footnote to that article: we asked him to publish it fully with an illustration of the bone object concerned and hoped to include it in this number. Its publication has been delayed by the author and he has asked us not to make our editorial comments until he and his colleagues have published several C14 dates. We wait patiently, having found the TL dates inconclusive and unconvincing. Meanwhile we



recommend to our readers a short paper by Professor E. T. Hall that appeared in *Nature*, vol. 257, no. 5525, pp. 355-6, for 2 October 1975. We quote these sentences from this article: 'A number of the archaeological objections to the authenticity of the site would be removed if it were found that certain of the objects were genuine and some false. For instance: one might postulate that the highly fired tablets were genuine, but the weird face urns, phallic symbols, bone and pebble carvings were not; if the ceramics in the latter category have been fabricated from tiles or bricks fired in antiquity and reconstituted, this could give an explanation of their apparent ancient TL date. . . . Although the site has been extensively and randomly dug by different excavators, if the site is genuine, some objects must remain and their archaeological contexts may help to explain this perplexing problem.'

And while we are discussing what must still remain one of the oddest affairs in current archaeology, we are all reminded of the strange affair of the Hogersmilde artifacts.

☞ Our good friend and colleague Professor Waterbolk of the Biologisch-Archaeologisch Instituut at Groningen writes (2 October 1975): 'I was told that you were considering to pay some attention in ANTIQUITY to the disclosure of an archaeological fake in the Netherlands, in which our Institute was involved. Since the news of this fake has reached the international press in a rather unsatisfactory form, I include for your information a copy of Mr Stapert's contribution on this matter for the next volume of *Palaeohistoria*, which will appear before the end of this year.'

By now some of our readers will have read

Dick Stapert's article entitled *Preliminary Notes on the 'Early and Middle Palaeolithic Finds of Mr T. Vermaning'*. Those who do not have *Palaeohistoria* readily available in their studies might like a brief summary of Stapert's exposé of this nonsensical affair. The following excerpts contain the nub of the affair:

From 1965 onwards, several groups of artifacts, including collections with an 'Early or Middle Palaeolithic' *habitus*, have been purchased for museums in the Netherlands from Mr T. Vermaning. The first of these assemblages consists of 127 artifacts of 'Middle Palaeolithic' character found according to Vermaning in two concentrations near Hogersmilde (Drenthe). These objects were bought by the Provincial Museum of Drenthe at Assen in 1965. In 1968 the *Stichting Nederlandsch Museum voor Anthropologie en Praehistorie* purchased from Vermaning a second and larger collection of artifacts (more than 400) also assumed to be Middle Palaeolithic age and, according to Vermaning, found in the neighbourhood of Hijken in the province of Drenthe... several other spectacular 'finds' have been displayed by Vermaning including a large collection from a third 'Middle Palaeolithic' find-spot at Eemster in the province of Drenthe and a smaller group, also assumed to be of Middle Palaeolithic type, from various find-spots near Ravenswoud in the province of Friedland.

Research by the present author... has indicated that all the artifacts classified as belonging to the Early or Middle Palaeolithic periods... are falsifications. The main arguments upon which this conclusion is based were summarized in a preliminary report which was presented to proprietors of the museums concerned; subsequently this report was published in a Dutch archaeological magazine (*Westerheem*, xxiv, 1975, 70-5). It was written in consultation with Professor H. T. Waterbolk: he also shared the formal responsibility for the contents of it... All the artifacts in question show uniform traces of grinding, which are in general present only upon the ridges between flake scars. These traces cannot be explained in terms of natural processes or as use-wear... The surfaces produced by deliberate flaking on all these artifacts have no traces at all of white, coloured, or other forms of patina, or of wind-gloss. Such surface-modifications are, however, present on all

Middle Palaeolithic artifacts from the Netherlands not associated with Vermaning... None of these hundreds of presumed Early or Middle Palaeolithic artifacts shows any evidence of secondary frost-splitting... Most of the artifacts have a glossy appearance, thus suggesting a form of gloss-patination as it is known on most of the Late Palaeolithic artifacts in the Netherlands. This shiny layer can, however, easily be washed away with the help of water and soap... Some of the artifacts preserve remnants of old natural surfaces (originated prior to manufacture), which are mostly the result of frost-splitting. Several of these surfaces hardly show any patination, indicating that the flints used for the production of these artifacts were until recently present in nearly fresh condition...

Excavations conducted by the present author at the spot indicated by Vermaning to him personally as the site near Hijken which yielded more than 400 'Middle Palaeolithic' artifacts did not produce any evidence whatsoever pointing to habitation in Palaeolithic times, but on the other hand some Mesolithic artifacts were found... not present in the Vermaning collection.

Stapert reminds us that van der Waals and Waterbolk published an article on these finds in 1967 in the *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* (pp. 177-89), but that they now fully support the view that the artifacts are falsifications. It is interesting to learn now that Professor Bordes and Dr McBurney expressed doubts concerning the authenticity of the finds from Hogersmilde in 1969 and 1971. Their doubts have now been confirmed.

Dr Nowell Myres writes in a letter to the Editor:

I was glad to see what you wrote in *ANTIQUITY* about John Bradford. I wish you had put in two other things about him. (a) his remarkable undergraduate excavation with Richard Goodchild (they were both my pupils) at the Frilford sanctuary, which must have been one of the first to trace a complete complex of Roman buildings entirely from robber trenches: and so make sense of the very interesting Frilford site. (b) (which I mention *pietatis causa*) his devotion to my Father. It was Bradford who organized

single-handed, after his death, the Memorial Fund which New College administers, to finance a Myres Memorial Lecture every other year. This was an extraordinary thing for a young man to do for an old one, long retired when he came to know him: and it was very much appreciated by my Mother, on whom he used to pay regular formal calls after my Father's death, and by

Yours ever,
Nowell Myres

Those who have read with sadness and disillusion the amazing revelations in Karl Meyer's *The plundered past* (*Antiquity*, XLVIII, 1974, 2–5) will have been reminded of some of the more scandalous goings-on in the worlds of archaeology, art collecting, museums and international intrigue by two excellent BBC Chronicle programmes, produced by Julia Cave, entitled *The Plunderers* and first broadcast on BBC 2 on 8 and 15 December 1975. The second of these programmes was called *The Hot Pot* and dealt extensively with the Euphronios vase bought in 1972 by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York for a million dollars, money which Von Bothmer, Curator of Greek and Roman art in the Met, had obtained by selling the museum's collection of ancient coins. Most of these coins—some eleven thousand—had been on loan to the American Numismatic Society where, for more than half a century, they had served as a library for historians and students of art and architecture.

There is *no* mystery about how the Met obtained the Euphronios vase: they bought it from Robert E. Hecht Jr, an American dealer in Rome. It was first seen by the Met representatives on 27 June 1972 in the Zurich garden of a Fritz Buerki, a restorer listed in the Zurich directory as a *sitzmoberschreiner* (or chair-mender). There *is* a mystery as to where Hecht got the pot that appeared in this Zurich garden. Hecht says it was from an Armenian dealer called Dikran A. Sarrafian ('I wasted most of my life with whores and archaeologists') who lived in Beirut and said that his father 'got it by exchange with an amateur against a collection of Greek and Roman gold

and silver coins in February or March of 1920 in London'. Others, including the Italian authorities, suspect that the vase came from an illegal dig by the *tombaroli*—the grave robbers—in Etruria in the fall of 1971. Gage of *The Observer* interviewed at Cerveteri a man called Armando Cenere, nicknamed *il Ciccione*—who said that with five other men digging at Santangelo near by in mid-November 1971 they discovered fragments of a Greek vase which seemed to be that now displayed in the Met.

Neither Karl Meyer nor Julia Cave and her research team claim they have the answer to the ultimate origin of the calyx krater described by the Director of the Met, T. F. Hoving, as a work of art about which one can say unhesitatingly that it is the best in existence, that it is one of the two or three finest works of art ever gained by the Metropolitan, and that from this moment '... the histories of art will have to be rewritten'. Nor does John L. Hess in his treatment of the affair in his fascinating and amusing book *The grand acquiritors* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974, 178 pp., 32 pls, \$5.95). This book, described by the publishers as 'a funny, angry, sharp—indeed, a very sharp—book about the world of art in general and Thomas Hoving and his Metropolitan Museum of Art in particular', should be read by all interested in how some museums acquire their specimens. He tells us a sad story of how artists, benefactors, and the general public are exploited by a handful of men who convert public and professional power to private ends. We quote the beginning of his fifteenth chapter entitled 'The loot in the basement':

Every American museum that collects ancient art is, or was until recently, a knowing receiver of stolen goods. The antiquities collection of the greatest of them all, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, was in fact founded on loot. As its published history recounts without shame, its first director, General Luigi Palma di Cesnola, more or less illegally dug up 35,000 art objects on the island of Cyprus while he was United States consul there after the Civil War and smuggled them out of the country in defiance

of a Turkish ban. Outbidding the Hermitage and the Louvre, the founders of the Met bought the collection—or rather most of it, since a portion was lost at sea—for \$60,000 and with it acquired the services of Cesnola. Nearly a century later, with another flamboyant director at the helm, the Met was in the hassle of its life over a single item of suspect origin.

This hassle was of course over the Euphronios vase and the present-day flamboyant director is the man whom Hess calls ‘the permanent kerfuffle that is Hoving’ and a reporter nicknamed ‘Thomas Publicity Forever Hoving’. The story of the evasions, tergiversations and fantasies of Hoving and Von Bothmer are almost as unbelievable as the account of how the Met is run, the names and nature and non-suitable qualifications of its trustees and the way it gets funds by ‘de-accessioning’ some of its treasures. Hess tells very well the story of poor Miss Adelaide Milton de Groot who wrote in her will leaving her paintings to the Met in this clause:

Without limiting in any way the absolute nature of this bequest, I request the said Metropolitan Museum of Art not to sell any of said works of art.

This did not prevent the Met from selling fifty of her paintings: they argued that the request was precatory not mandatory.

In his acknowledgements Hess refers ‘to a number of devoted employees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who defied an order that no staff member speak to me. The revelations recounted here could not have been made without their help.’ And he prints a delicious limerick by a staff member of the Met:

The old pot, put together with plaster,
Is really a scandalous disaster.
Why can’t the trustees
Get off their knees
And de-accession their master?

Some of all this is funny but behind it all is the simple stark fact that the Met bought for a million dollars a pot with no provenance, a pot which represents the most expensive piece of archaeological loot.

☞ We in Britain have our own special problems regarding archaeological loot.

The Times on Tuesday, 25 November 1975, published the second leader under the title ‘Archaeological Loot’ which deserves careful reading and which they have allowed us to republish here:

The looting of Britain’s historical and archaeological sites by treasure hunters has of late increased, is still increasing, and must be rapidly diminished if a part of the nation’s cultural heritage is not to be destroyed. The looting is a by-product of two factors harmless in themselves, the greatly increased public interest in archaeology fostered by popular books, television and the press, and the availability of cheap metal-detecting devices. Such devices are now being widely used to search for ancient coins and metal implements and ornaments, and archaeological sites seem to the seekers obvious places in which to pursue their depredations, encouraged tacitly or openly by the purveyors of detecting equipment and dealers in antiquities. The Prime Minister’s recent acceptance of honorary membership of one of the treasure hunting clubs has even conferred upon the practice a spurious respectability.

The Prime Minister is doubtless unaware, as are the majority of the public and a fair proportion of those who pursue this activity, just what it may mean: the prehistoric fortress pitted with small craters where finds have been extracted, the scientific excavation raided and wrecked, the significant discovery that has to be concealed to avoid looting. Metal detectors detect only metal, and finds such as coins not only lose most of their historic value when dragged from their context but rob that context of archaeological evidence of the dating, trade connexions or political status which may be vital to its interpretation. Looted material is rarely published or even catalogued, and much of it disappears into the market, bereft of all but numismatic or technical interest.

Britain’s archaeological sites are already being destroyed at an appalling rate, and by the end of this century few will be left that have not been taken into the guardianship of government. To have even those deprived of their potential for contributing to our unwritten history is intolerable.

Looters already commit a range of offences

from trespass and theft to the concealment of treasure trove and the damaging of scheduled ancient monuments, but prosecution for any of these offences is so rare that the antiquities legislation has become edentulous from disuse. Perhaps if treasure hunting were swiftly curbed on scheduled sites, and here a dozen instances of violation spring to mind, private landowners would feel that their efforts stood more chance of success.

There is need, however, for better antiquities laws as well as better enforcement. The law on treasure trove is obsolete and irrelevant to the archaeological importance of such objects; whether or not the owner had any intention of recovering his goods is no basis for determining whether such a crucial find as the recent hoard of early Christian plate from Water Newton should be left with its finder or seized to the Crown. The Government should learn from the example of some of its former colonies, which have legislation extending state protection to any class of archaeological site or material: treasure trove should be replaced by a statute governing not only precious metals but all associated material in their archaeological context capable of extension to other categories of evidence; and the destruction of archaeological sites, at present allowed after due notice unless positive protective action is taken, should be prohibited without specific permission given only after the site's local and national importance has been considered. Both of those steps could be taken in a short Bill. If some such action is not taken soon the Sibylline books of our country's past will have been burnt unread.

This leader was followed by a letter on Wednesday, 26 November, by Charles Sparrow, Honorary Legal Adviser to the Council for British Archaeology, and with his permission we reproduce his letter:

Sir, Your percipient leader on the subject of antiquities law is greatly to be welcomed. It is really time that the public were made aware of the fundamental absurdity of treasure trove, as a means of protecting antiquities.

The doctrine of treasure trove is, in truth, a piece of revenue law and has no direct or natural connexion with archaeology. The doctrine itself is of such extreme antiquity that its origins are obscure. Its purpose may have been simply to create an additional source of revenue by

forfeiture; but it may, as I think, have been intended to discourage the loss of tribal wealth through hoarding. An essential for any finding of treasure trove is that the owner intended to conceal the object and later recover it. The coroner's jury sits to determine whether such an intention existed.

The determination of this question is manifestly irrelevant to any scheme for protecting antiquities. It is also a ridiculous exercise. How can one rationally attempt to establish the mental attitude of a notional individual, whose name, occupation and involvement with the object are unknown and unknowable? Yet this is the exercise for which coroners' inquests are solemnly convened and upon which depends the destination of important antiquities. If the dice fall one way, the object finds its way into a museum; if they fall another way, the object remains in the private ownership of a landowner and may go anywhere.

As your leader so rightly points out, the present state of affairs could be rectified by a very short Bill. Such a Bill would have the rare advantage of actually saving government money. The heart of such legislation would be the extension of Crown protection to all gold and silver finds, regardless of the notional owner's supposed intention. Even as matters stand, every such object is potentially Crown property; and the landowner's interest is dependent on juridical chance. So there could be no significant hardship to landowners in making the extension. Moreover, in that event, coroners' inquests on treasure trove would cease and their cost would be saved.

On 5 December *The Times* published a further letter on the same subject by Peter Addyman, Director of the York Archaeological Trust, and with his permission we reprint this letter here:

The full absurdity of current treasure trove law has to be experienced to be believed. York Archaeological Trust, having encountered it several times in the course of recent controlled archaeological excavations in York, is at present awaiting yet another expensive inquest to decide undecidable things about one small category among the thousands of objects excavated this year.

The finds in question are 35 silver *denarii*, found in three piles in the foundations of an

early Roman building. If they are a foundation deposit, buried without intention of recovery, they lie outside the Coroner's jurisdiction and return to join other finds from the site. If they are a hoard which someone expected to recover, the Coroner will seize them for the Crown.

Superficially the decision might seem a simple one because they were built into foundations. There does not, however, appear to be a Roman tradition for burying groups of votive objects in this way and specialists we have consulted have given divergent opinions. The Trust will await the jury's verdict with interest.

These repeated inquests, expensive though they are, have a charm and antiquarian interest of their own. We would probably be in favour of preserving them as a good old British tradition were it not for the fact that they masquerade as a means of control over objects of archaeological value. In practice they are only concerned with a minute proportion of archaeological finds, and not necessarily the most important. As they stand they disrupt the orderly administration of archaeological excavations for the oddest of purposes; and paradoxically they could result in the dispersion of finds which should be kept together.

A new and sensible law for the control of antiquities is indeed long overdue.

The Times leader and the two letters we have republished state the case much more cogently than we could. We must have a new and sensible law for the control of antiquities and the prevention of archaeological loot. As Peter Addyman says in a letter to us, 'Treasure Trove Law seems to me to be on a par with druidism, a worthy target for public ridicule in the editorial pages of ANTIQUITY.'

It looks alarmingly as though the lunatic fringes of archaeology are closing in on Cambridge. On 28 November 1975 the *Cambridge Evening News* published the following letter from Mr O. W. Catling:

It is perhaps more than coincidence that the stone circle, discovered at Gt Wilbraham, appears to lie on a straight line which can be drawn from the South Coast to the North Norfolk coast, passing through or along many significant place names.

These may be seen to be: Arundel Castle, Stane St, Bechworth Castle, Box Hill, Tot House, Buck House, Waltham Cross, Hoddesdon, Stanstead Abbot, Hadham Cross, Standon, Stump Cross, Ickneild Way, Burwell Castle, Shippea Hill, and Syderstone.

Surely this must be an Old Straight Track, the existence of many of which was realized by Alfred Watkins about 1920.

Could there not also be some connexion between this circle and the—unfortunately buried—Gods cut in the hillside of the Gogs?

Incidentally, why should these not be completely excavated? Apart from their historical importance, they would be a tremendous asset in the area as a unique tourist attraction, since they are the largest and most complex hill figures known in Britain.

We published a photograph of the Wilbraham site in *Antiquity*, vol. XLIX, no. 195, September 1975, pl. xx, and now publish a copy of John Alexander's answer to Mr Catling's ridiculous letter:

As a director of the University's recent excavation at Great Wilbraham, I was fascinated, if mystified, by the letter from Mr Catling of Burwell which you published on Friday 28 November. There is no stone circle at Great Wilbraham, as the article by Rodney Tibbs in the *Cambridge Evening News* showed and the work we did there cannot possibly be held to support any 'Old Straight Track' theory, a way of approaching the evidence long denied by archaeologists.

Mr Catling's reference to figures cut into the chalk at Wandlebury on the Gog Magog hills is more interesting, for although there has been much debate on their genuineness and their existence cannot be taken as established, he is right in suggesting that more work is necessary there.

But what goes on in the scholarly purlieu of the ancient University of Cambridge? As we go to the press we have received an extraordinary leaflet from the Institute of Geomantic Research, 142 Pheasant Rise, Bar Hill, Cambridge. We print the first paragraph of its leaflet:

The Institute of Geomantic Research (IGR) has been set up as a non profit making organiza-

tion to study all aspects of geomantic research in Britain and Northern Europe. The IGR aims to co-ordinate and publish original work in the following fields of geomancy:—

Landscape geometry, leys, alignments, figures, etc., terrestrial zodiacs, geodetic studies (dowsing etc.), sacred geometry, ancient metrology, legendary geomancy.

The Institute will produce a journal at regular intervals in which this research will be presented in the form of complete papers and working notes.

We are told that the Institute's first publication is now available entitled *Landscape geometry of southern Britain* by Michael Behrend, price 35p + p. & p., free to members.

The lunatic fringes of archaeology are becoming too large. Why is this? And what is geomancy, anyhow? The *OED* says it is 'the art of divination by means of lines and figures, formed originally by throwing earth on some surface, and later by jotting down on paper dots at random'.

Dots at random? It seems to us that the geomants are dotties at random.

☞ We were delighted, and our delight will be shared by all our readers, that the New Year Honours List contained the news that a DBE had been conferred on Dr Joan Evans, an award which as Peterborough said, in a pungent paragraph in *The Daily Telegraph* for 3 January, was long overdue. The mills of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood move slowly but eventually grind out most of the right answers. We now have two archaeological dames, and we think they are the only two: Dame Kathleen Kenyon and Dame Joan Evans, and how profoundly these two most distinguished ladies deserve this honour for the services they have rendered to archaeological scholarship and public life. We hope the common and combination rooms of our universities have more such great women in the making, and, who knows, one day we might have an archaeological Dame Grand Cross!

We reproduce here as our frontispiece a photograph of Dame Joan taken at the time when the President and other officials of the Society of Antiquaries visited her at Thousand Acres in Wotton-under-Edge to present to her the Gold

Medal of the Society on her eightieth birthday: 22 June 1973. We have already referred to that occasion (*Antiquity*, 1973, 169): this photograph shows her with Dr John Cowen, then Vice-President. In his 1973 Anniversary Address to the Society, Dr Nowell Myres said that the Council in awarding the medal were 'expressing not only our affectionate admiration for her personal qualities, but also our deep appreciation of all that she and her family have done for the Society over a period of time which far exceeds the normal span of two generations'. Long may she be with us.

☞ There have been this spring two wonderful exhibitions of gold work and jewellery from Eastern Europe. The exhibition of Scythian gold was such a success in both America and in Paris; we hope that it will one day and soon come to London. Meanwhile the exhibition of Thracian Treasure from Bulgaria opened in the British Museum in January and will be there until the end of March. Everyone who has the chance to be in London in March must see the Thracian exhibition. We remember vividly the opportunity we had, almost a quarter of a century ago, at the kind invitation of the Bulgarian Government, to see many of these treasures. Now there are many more. Here in this exhibition is the gold treasure of Vulcitrán found in 1924 in the north of the country, and the gold and silver armour and horse-trappings of the royal Thracian horsemen found by Professor Ivan Venedikov—the organizer of the exhibition—in the modern city of Vratza.

☞ One final note, as we go to press: it is brought to our notice that our fiftieth volume coincides with the centenary year of our printers and publishers, Heffers Printers Ltd. We should like, especially in these difficult times, to offer them our warmest good wishes for a prosperous year. We are happy to record that we work together in close amity and harmony, and the Production Editor has reason to be especially grateful to Mr and Mrs Terry Bilton who remain unmovedly efficient in the face of her occasionally unreasonable demands; and to Mr Frank Colliesson who, although he has now moved his helpful energies to Heffers great bookshop, has not ceased to show a lively interest in the fortunes of ANTIQUITY, and to be a fountain of wise advice.